

REMARKS

Claims 1-130 were pending in the application. Claims 1-21, 48-85, and 116-130 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 22-27 and 37-43 were rejected. Claims 28-36, 44-47, and 86-106 were objected to. Claims 22, 24, 40, and 41 are canceled. Claims 23, 25-28, 33, 37, 39, 42-44, 96, and 115 are amended. Claims 131-145 are added. Claims 23, 25-39, 42-47, 86-115, and 131-145 are now pending in the application. Claims 28, 33, 44, and 96 are the independent claims. Reconsideration of the amended application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner required new corrected drawings due to several noted informalities. In response, new formal drawings are submitted herewith.

The Examiner rejected claims 26 and 27 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the phrase “the first and second pluralities of bricks” lacks antecedent basis. The noted phrase has been replaced by the “the first and second permanent magnet masses”, which derives antecedent basis from claim 22.

The Examiner rejected claims 22-27 and 37-43 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Zuk et al. The Examiner also objected to claims 28-36, 44-47, and 86-106 as depending from a rejected base claim, but acknowledged that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 28 is rewritten in independent form, including all the features of independent claim 22 and intervening claims 40 and 24, which are canceled. Claims 29-

32 depend from claim 28. The objections to claims 28-32, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claims 23, 26, and 27 are amended to depend from allowable claim 28 rather than canceled claim 22. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claim 25 is amended to depend from allowable claim 28 rather than canceled claim 24. The rejection of this claim, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claims 37 and 39 are amended to depend from allowable claim 28 rather than canceled claim 22. Claim 38 depends from claim 37. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claim 33 is rewritten in independent form, including all the features of independent claim 22 and intervening claims 40 and 24, which are canceled. Claims 34-36, 47, and 86-95 depend from claim 33. The objections to claims 33-36, 47, and 86-95, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claim 44 is rewritten in independent form, including all the features of independent claim 22 and intervening claims 40 and 41, which are canceled. Claims 45 and 46 depend from claim 44. The objections to claims 44-46, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claim 42 is amended to depend from allowable claim 44 rather than canceled claim 40. The rejection of this claim, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claim 43 is amended to depend from allowable claim 28 rather than canceled claim 41. The rejection of this claim, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Claim 96 is rewritten in independent form, including all the features of independent claim 22, which is canceled. Claims 97-106 depend from claim 96. The

objections to claims 96-106, therefore, should be withdrawn. The Examiner did not address claims 107-113, which read on the elected species and were not withdrawn from the application. Claims 107-113 depend from claim 96, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 96 is deemed allowable.

The Examiner also did not address claims 114 and 115, which read on the elected species and were not withdrawn from the application. Claim 114 depends from allowable claim 28; it is respectfully submitted that claim 114 is allowable as well. Claim 115 is amended to depend from allowable claim 28, rather than from canceled claim 24; it is respectfully submitted that claim 115 is allowable as well.

New claims 131-136 depend from allowable claim 33, and recite the subject matter of claims 23, 26, 27, and 37-39, respectively. It is respectfully submitted that these new claims are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

New claims 137-139 depend from allowable claim 44, and recite the subject matter of claims 26, 37, and 38, respectively. It is respectfully submitted that these new claims are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

New claims 140-145 depend from allowable claim 96, and recite the subject matter of claims 23, 26, 27, and 37-39, respectively. It is respectfully submitted that these new claims are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all objections and rejections have been overcome. It is therefore requested that the Amendment be entered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

A petition for extension of time is submitted herewith, along with a check in payment of the fee for the extension, and in payment of the fee for an excess independent claim added by this Amendment. If the check is missing, or made out for an insufficient amount, please charge any deficiency to our deposit account, No. 501998, and notify us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas M. Champagne
Registration No. 36,478
IP STRATEGIES, P.C.
1730 N Lynn Street
Suite 500
Arlington, Virginia 22209
703.248.9220
703.248.9244 fax

March 23, 2004

Date